

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 1-3 are amended. Claims 4-7 are newly added. Claims 1-3 are amended to address matters of form. Newly added dependent Claim 4 recites substantially similar features to original Claim 3, but depends only from Claim 2. Support for each of newly added Claims 5-7 can be found in Figs. 3 and 4, for example. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Toshio (Japanese Patent No. JP 5147890, herein “JP '890”) in view of Sevilleja-Perez et al. (PCT Publication No. WO 03/062115, herein “WO '115”).

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the courtesy of a personal interview granted by Primary Examiner Christopher Schwartz to Applicant’s representative. In combination with the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Schwartz, the substance of the personal interview is substantially summarized below in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part:

the braking disc the braking disc is configured to rotate together with the sheave when the movable portion is at the release position; and
the braking disc is stopped to brake rotation of the sheave when the movable portion is at the engagement position.

The outstanding Office Action states that “[i]t is unclear how a braking force can be exerted on the sheave by the pressing plate if the pressing disc 21 and pressing plate 23 both rotate with the sheave 16, as shown in figure 3. See line 12 of Claim 1.”¹

As discussed during the personal interview, Fig. 3 shows one non-limiting example of the invention recited in independent Claim 1. As further discussed during the personal interview, the braking (21) depicted in Fig. 1 rotates along with the deflector sheave (5) while the movable portion (29) is in the release position.

When the movable portion (29) is inserted into the engaging portion (27), the movable portion (29) stops the braking disc (21) from rotating. The braking disc (21) then rubs against the braking surface (19) to produce a drag force upon the deflector sheave (5). Accordingly, as discussed during the personal interview, the braking disc (21) rotates together with the sheave (5) while the movable portion (29) is released, but the braking disc (29) is prevented from rotating and can produce drag upon the sheave (5) when the movable portion (29) is in the engagement position as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Thus, the features recited in independent Claim 1 are enabled by the originally filed specification, and the rejection of Claim 1 and Claims 2-3 depending therefrom as failing to comply with the enablement requirement is overcome.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 as obvious over JP '890 in view of WO '115, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part:

a braking disc provided with a plurality of engaging portions along a rotational direction of the sheave, configured to be pressed against the sheave by the pressing device; and
an engaging device including a movable portion configured to be displaced between an engagement position corresponding to engagement with the engaging portions and a release position corresponding to release from the engaging portions, wherein

¹ Outstanding Office Action, page 2.

the braking disc is configured to rotate together with the sheave when the movable portion is at the release position; and the braking disc is stopped to brake rotation of the sheave when the movable portion is at the engagement position.

Accordingly, a braking disc is provided with a plurality of engaging portions. **The braking disc is configured to be pressed against the sheave by the pressing device.** The braking disc can rotate with the sheave when a movable portion is in a release position. The braking disc is stopped to brake rotation of the sheave when the movable portion is in an engagement position.

As discussed during the personal interview, the braking mechanism (15) shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of JP '890 is applied to a shaft directly connected to a motor (8). As further discussed during the personal interview, the outstanding Office Action relies on the disc (25) for the braking disc or braking device recited in independent Claim 1. However, as shown by comparison of Figs. 1 and 2 in JP '890, and discussed during the personal interview, the components related to the assembly (15) are **separated from the sheave (7)**. None of the components in the assembly (15) is configured to be pressed against the sheave (7) by a pressing device.

WO '115 fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above regarding JP '890. Rather, as discussed during the personal interview, the brake described in WO '115 is unrelated to a sheave. The brake described in WO '115 is configured to slip onto a polygonal motor shaft via the hub (12), and no sheave is apparent in the description of the brake.² Accordingly, WO '115 does not disclose a braking disc provided with a plurality of engaging portions along a rotational direction of a sheave and configured to be pressed against the sheave by a pressing device. Thus, WO '115 suffers from the same deficiencies discussed above regarding JP '890. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no proper combination of JP '890 and WO '115 would include all of the features recited in independent Claim 1.

² WO '115, page 3, lines 25-31.

Claims 2-7 each depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent Claim 1 and patentably distinguish over any proper combination of JP '890 and WO '115 for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1 does.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Lee L. Stepina
Registration No. 56,937